Our Annual Meeting commenced on Friday before the third Lord's day of Sept. and closed on Monday following, at Cynthianna, Ky. This meeting will be thankfully remembered through eternity by many. It was a season of refreshing to hundreds—not as many professed faith in the Lord and united with the church, as we have seen. About 1[illegible] during the meeting. A particular account may be expected in the next No.—The meeting was numerously attended. EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM AUG. 1ST TO OCT. 1ST.

KENTUCKY.—Salvisa, By Elder Leonard Flemming, $1 for I. Allen. *Harrodsburg*, By ——, for Mary Allen 1, and Agnes Moseby 1. *Georgetown*, By ——, for Robt. Ramsey, 1, Jas. Grant 1. *Dry Creek*, By J. G. Ellis $5, of which 1 for J. Ellis, 1 for Jas. Dedman, 1 for W. G. Ellis, 1 for Fred. Kleet, 1 for W. Stevens. *Bethel*, Hill. Roberts 1, Betsey Williams 1.—*Athens*, Nathan Petit 1. *Lexington*, By Ben. Cassell, 2 for John Wilson and Geo. Shivery. *Leesburg*, By Jo. Wasson, 2 for self and A. Chinn. *Centreville*, Geo. Palmer 1, P. Ward 1. *Frankfort*, By A. Dudley 5, for Mrs. Harvie 1. for Sam. Ware 1, Jas. Ross 1, for P. Dudley 1, for self 1, O. T. Major 1. *New Castle*, By Elder S. Marshall 3; for S. Scott 1, E. Thomas 1, C. Sanford 1. *Williamsburg*' By W. Workman 1 62½ in full. *Carlisle*, By J. Rogers 2; by W. Hall 1. *Corneliusville*, By J. G. Ellis, for John Terril 1, Wm. Terril 1, J. Gilman of Newport 1, Mat. Dobbins of Gains' ✕ Roads 2, for Fredenburgh of Dry Creek 0 50, J. Taylor of do. 1 50. *Cane Run*, By John Graves for self 1, I. Rungan 1, J. Henderson 1, by Mr. Farrell 0 50, *Minerva*, By A. Alexander $5. *Paris*, By H. Parker 1; Mr. Henderson by T. M. Allen 1. *Flemingsburg*, By Geo. Sousley for self 1, T. Taylor 1, F. Freelin 2. *Republican*, By Maj. Faulconer, 11 50; by R. & A. Ray 2. *Cynthianna*, I. Cartmel $18; L. Woolen 1. *Paris*, By Philip Grimes 1. *Millersburg*, By Jo. Mitchel 1. *Falmouth*, By F. Chalfant $5; for self 1, for C. Kennett 1, McArta 2, Wm. Rule 1. *Mt. Carmel*, Ben. Brandon 1. *Union*, By Elder T. M. Allen, for Thos. Moore 2.—*OHIO. Rutland*, By Rodney Downing 2 for Nathan Simpson, *New Paris*, By P. Dickey, for John Adams 1, By H. D. Palmer for Danl. Davis of *Bruceville, Ia.* 1, for P. Ursley and self, of *Carlisle, Ia.* 2, for Danl. Travis of Bloomington 1.

INDIANA. Bloomington, By Dr. Roach $12. *Rockville*, By T. Nisbit for P. Harris 2. *Edinburg*, By Gav. Mitchell 5; for self 2, for E. Dawson (vol. 3) 1, for H Maskill (vol. 3) 87½, for Elder Jo Hatchill 12½ for Jas. Vanzant of Columbus 1.—*Cynthianna*, John Johnson 3.

ILLINOIS. Springfield, By Mr. Trumbo 5; for Merriman 1, Henry 1, Radford 1, Goolan 1, himself 1. *Palestine*, Wm. Wilson 3.

☞ Many communications on hand, which shall receive all due attention. ED.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."—PAUL.

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY.—NOVEMBER 1831. [No. 11.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

REPLY ON UNION, COMMUNION, AND THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

In speaking or writing on this subject of *Union*, more than on most others, we deceive ourselve and one another, without knowing or intending it. The want of precision in the meaning attached to our terms may be the cause of this. It might appear hypercritical, or perhaps something worse, to ask the worthy editor of the Christian Messenger what he means by "*union in form?*" Does he mean a formal confederation of all preachers and people called "*Christians*," with all those whom he calls *Reformed* Baptists? (rather *reforming* than *reformed;*) or (as he represents them as prefering for a *sectarian* purpose the name) disciples. If so, what shall be the articles of confederation, and in what *form* shall they be ministered or adopted?—Shall it be in one general convention of messengers from all the societies of "Christians" and "disciples," or one general assembly of the whole aggregate of both people? Shall the articles of agreement be drawn up in writing like the articles of the "General Union" amongst the different sects of Baptists in Kentucky?

Hast here been an incident in ecclesiastical history of a whole people formally and in good faith uniting with another whole people without such a formal confederation? Or does he expect a "union in form" without any form of effecting it? If he does not, then it is out of order to complain of the want of a formal union until a proposition made to that effect shall have been submitted by the complainant, and rejected by the defendant. But such a proposition has not, as we have heard, been tendered; nor have we heard of any general meeting among the Christians to deliberate upon the terms and conditions. Or does he think that one or two individuals, of and from themselves, should propose and effect a formal union among the hundreds of congregations scattered over this continent, called christians or

disciples, without calling upon the different congregations to express an opinion or a wish upon the subject?

It is, too, a question with some weak consciences, whether there can, in spirit and in truth, under Jesus Christ, in existing circumstances, be such a thing as some might denominate a wholesale union between two whole societies as such. Men, we know, grouped in whole states, can confederate for political purposes; but it is for temporal and temporary objects, in which other principles are supreme, than those refined sensibilities springing from faith in Jesus and love to the saints, which constitute, if not the bond, the concentrating principle of union, among the faithful followers of Jesus Christ. These are questions which we only propose without a discussion or an answer. We solicit the most definitive view of brother Stone on these topics.

We discover, or think we discover, a squinting at some sort of precedency or priority in the claims of the writer of the above article, which are perhaps only in appearance, and not in reality; but if in appearance only, he will prevent us or any reader from concluding unfavorably by explaining himself more in detail than he has done. He says, "The reformed Babtists have received the doctrine taught by us many years ago." "For nearly thirty years ago we taught," &c. &c. From what source or principle these sayings proceeded, we do not pronounce sentence; but if they are mere words of course, and he intended to plead nothing from them, we would suggest the propriety of qualifying them in such a way as to prevent mistake.

I am, as at present advised, far from thinking that the present advocates of reformation are only pleading, or at all pleading, for what was plead in Kentucky thirty years ago, after the dissolution of the Springfield Presbytery. If such be the conceptions of brother Stone, I am greatly mistaken. That he, with others, did at that time oppose authoritative creeds, and some articles in them as terms of communion, and some other abuses, we are not uninformed; but so did some others who set out with him. And as he would not consider them as now pleading the cause which he now pleads, so we cannot think that the cause which we plead was plead either by him or any one else *twenty* years ago. Many persons both in Europe and America, have inveighed against sects, creeds, confessions, councils, and human dogmas, during the last two centuries, and some even before Luther's time; but what have these to do with the present proposed reformation? That is only the work of a pioneer: it is clearing the forests, girdling the trees, and burning the brush.

I am not ashamed to own that the greatest heretics in christendom have inveighed against creeds, councils, and human dogmas. And every man who has been persecuted rightfully or wrongfully, has denounced the creed and the council which decreed him to the stake. Our opponents tell us of all this;

and if Satan, even Satan tell the truth, he ought to be believed. But this admitted neither makes their cause who opposes us the better, nor ours the worse.

Both friends and foes of the cause which we now plead, seem to be agreed that not the anti-creed, and anti-council, and anti-sectarian questions, but what may be denominated the questions of "the ancient gospel and ancient order of things," distinguish it most easily from every other cause plead on this continent or in Europe since the great apostacy. Not, indeed, because it has not some things in common with other causes; but because when all the common things are taken into the account, it presents what some of our opponents call a new religion—an exhibit of christianity as different from the sectarian as Protestantism differs from Popery; and if I were to give my opinion, I would say, much more different.

I trust our brother Editor will not think that we are merely disputing his claims to priority, as it is not assumed by us that he has set up such a claim; but only that in appearance it squints that way: but that he will consider us as endeavoring to prevent the confounding of the *ancient gospel* and *ancient order of things* with the anti-creed, or anti-council, or anti-sectarian cause. Sorry would I be to think that any would be so indiscriminating as to identify the principles of this reformation with the principles of any other reformation preached since Luther was born.

Catholics oppose sects as much as the Editors of the Messenger and Harbinger. Methodists oppose hypercalvinism as much as either of us; and all heretics oppose authoritative creeds which condemn their opinions. So far I am a Catholic, a Methodist, and a heretic. But many great and good men have opposed these evils as much as either Catholics, Methodists, or heretics.

Our eagle-eyed opponents plainly see the difference between the radical and differential attributes of this reformation, which they ignorantly call a deformation, and any other cause, however unpopular, plead in the land "The Christians" in some places, nay, in many places, are quite respectable in the eyes of those who contemn "the disciples" as unfit for good society. And I think the amiable editor of the Christian Messenger himself told me last winter, that even he and some of his brethren were considered by the orthodox as degrading themselves because they associated with us most "unworthy disciples." Indeed, it was no mean proof of his christian spirit to see him so condescending to persons of such low degree in the estimation of the noble christians of the land. His willingness to fraternize with us in despite of the *odium theologicum* attached to our ancient gospel, I must ever regard as additional proof of his unfeigned regard to the authority of Jesus as Lord, and his love to all them who esteem the reproach of the Messiah greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt.

For our part, we might be honored much by a union formal and public, with a society so large and so respectable as the Christian denomination; but if our union with them, though so advantageous to us, would merge "the ancient gospel and ancient order of things" in the long vexed question of simple anti-creedism, or anti-sectarianism, I should be ashamed of myself in the presence of him whose "*well done, good and faithful servant,*" is worth the universe to me. We all could have had honorable alliances with honorable sectaries, many years since, had this been our object.

These remarks have all grown out of the seeming identification of the cause we plead with that plead in Kentucky some 25 or 30 years ago. Had not these appeared in the preceding article, there would have been no occasion for saying a word on this subject.

Our good brother *Stone* has not been himself when he wrote the above article, as we are not ourselves when we read it. He says, "We do not object to *their opinions* as terms of fellowship between us; but they seriously and honestly object to some of *ours*." This fails not in christian courtesy to our *honesty* and *sincerity;* but in argument it fails: for when he proceeds to state his *opinions*, which are supposed to be our *reasons* why we cannot unite in form with them, these *reasons* and *opinions* are comprehended in a *unit*, and that happens to be not an *opinion*, but a *practice*. It is called "Objection 1st." (but I cannot find the 2d.) and reads in the following words:—"*That we have fellowship and commune with unimmersed persons.*"

This is the only objection which is alleged in the whole article as lying in the way of our uniting with them. It is, then, the *practice* of setting aside a divine institution, not in the judgment of the person received, but in the judgment of those who receive him.

It was not through design, but I think through oversight, that our worthy brother then turns the attention of his reader from this *practice* to the meaning of baptism for the remission of sins: for it is not because of our views of the meaning of immersion, (in which he seems to agree with us,) but because the "Christians" now make immersion of non-effect by receiving persons into the kingdom of Jesus, so called, irrespective of their being legitimately born; or in brief, regardless of the command, "*Be baptized every one of you.*"

Thus he loses sight of our objection altogether; and we find him lamenting the fate of some poor Paidobaptist, not in Hades, not in Purgatory; but, as he says, literally and truly in Hell, praying for himself because he had simply mistaken his road.

The words which our brother Stone has put into the mouth of this mistaken Paidobaptist, suffering the vengeance of an eternal fire, are not exactly in point. It was indeed, kind to make this imaginary Paido tell as good a story of himself as possible. "In the humble spirit of obedience I submitted to be sprinkled." But I do not know how this Paidobaptist could, even in torment, so far forget himself as to say that "in the humble spirit of obedience he submitted to be sprinkled," when in fact he was, when a crying babe, sprinkled in his father's arms. And to be in point, such must have been the fact; *for it is not fair to take any other than a common case to sustain a common practice.*

But in this whole case there is an entire mistake of the whole question. It assumes a principle inadmissible, viz: That God's rule or principle of rewarding men hereafter, is to be, as near as we can guess at it, the rule of our conduct to them in receiving them into his kingdom on earth, and in treating them as members of it. I will undertake, without fee or reward, to plead the cause of every soul in torment, and guaranty his release, or prevent his condemnation to it, on the principles embraced in the prayer of this unfortunate Paidobaptist. Every sincere Mussulman, Pagan, Infidel, Jew, Deist, Atheist, under Heaven, may convert Hell into a Purgatory, if you will give validity and prevalence to this plea. And as for the *insincere*, we shall find for them a good plea of another sort. But the question is, Are we authorized to make the sincerity and honesty of a person's mind a rule of our conduct? 'Tis God alone who is judge of this, and surely he would not require us to act by a rule which he can never apply to the case. Neither, perhaps, is it a fair proposition to assume that any man's sincerity in opinion or belief will have any weight in the final judgment; but whether or not, it cannot be a rule of our proceeding in any case. We judge from actions—God judges the heart; and, therefore, we look for visible obedience; and when we are assured that the Lord has commanded every man to confess him, or to profess the faith and be immersed into his name, we can never justify ourselves before God or man in presuming in our "judgment of charity" to set aside his commandment, and in accepting for it a human substitute.

We do not recollect that we have ever argued out the merits of this "free and open communion system." But one remark we must offer in passing, that we must regard it as one of the weakest and most vulnerable causes ever plead; and that the "*great*" Mr. Hall, as he is called, has, in his defence of the practice, made it appear worse than before. In attempting to make it reasonable, he has only proved how unreasonable and unscriptural it is.

But of the following sentence we complain:—"We cannot, with our present views, unite on the opinion that unimmersed persons cannot receive the remission of sins." This is not the question at all. And long before a word was said about baptism for remission, our friend plead for dispensing with it, because, in his judgment, it ought to be no term of communion. But we shall dismiss this topic, and when our friend Stone shall

think good to reconsider his remarks, we shall more *in extenso* exhibit the true merits of this objection.

An attempt is made by our friend to draw out of a remark on the appropriation of the name Christian, vol. 1, p. 373, a second objection urged by the friends of reform against union with the Christians. But I must confess I never heard that any advocate of the ancient gospel asked any person to give up the name "*Christian*" and to substitute for it the name *Disciple*. Yet he says, "We cannot conscientiously give up the name "Christian," acknowledged by our brethren most appropriate, for any other (as *disciple*) less appropriate, and received (assumed) to avoid the disgrace of being suspected to be a Unitarian or Trinitarian. We cannot thus temporize with divine truth." Well, brother Stone, do not *temporize* with divine ordinances by substituting sincere sprinkling for sincere obedience, or for immersion. But, really, I confess ignorance on the whole subject of this requisition to abandon the name Christian. I only wish, for my part, that we were worthy of it. It is easy to assume a good name, but how hard to deserve it! I am not prepared, either, to say *Amen* to all the criticism offered to prove that we must, by *divine authority*, be called Christians, whether we deserve it or not.

The controversy about the name by which we shall be called, is, and must necessarily be, one of subordinate importance. We could not in good conscience substitute the *opinion* of Dr. Doddridge for the literal import of the word (*chrematizo.*) We must always in interpreting distinguish between the *opinion* of a translator and the *meaning* of the word. Every body knows that there are no words in the Greek corresponding to "*divine appointment.*" And if ever *chrematizo* signifies to name or call by divine authority, it is most certainly from accident or from circumstances, and not from the import of the term: *for it means no such thing.* The root of the word is *chrema*, business; and because it was usual to designate or name persons from their business, as Smith, Tailor, Baker, Clarke, &c. so the word *chrematizo*, formed from *chrema*, came actively to signify, to name, or to call, and passively to be named or called.

When brother Stone was quoting the 4th meaning of the word from Parkhurst, it would have been well for him to have let his readers know the mind of this same Mr. Parkhurst. He says, "Westein on Rom. VII. 3. has abundantly proved that the verb frequently signifies in the Greek writers to be *named* or *called.* But Doddridge thinks that *chrematisai*, Acts II. 26, denotes to be named by divine appointment or direction. *I cannot, however, find that the verb ever has this signification.* The passages of scripture to which the Doctor refers in proof of his interpretation, *do by no means come up to his point.*" With this opinion of Parkhurst I do most sincerely concur, and when it becomes necessary I will go into the details.

Our worthy friend has been too precipitate also in quoting

Adam Clarke on this passage. Adam Clarke begins the section from which he quotes with an *if*—"*if*, therefore, the name was given by divine appointment." He enters not decisively into the matter.

That the word sometimes signifies to warn, admonish, or appoint, whether by God, angels, or men, is abundantly evident, and occurs sometimes in this acceptation in the New Testament. In this we agree with Adam Clarke. But with Dr. Campbell we agree that *chrematizo* does not necessarily imply *from God* more than the word *warning* does. This is evident from the reference which, both in sacred authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. He condemns Dr. Doddridge's version of Acts II. 26. (See his note on Math. II. 12.) I am bold to affirm, in the face of all criticism, that there is not the least authority, *in the word here used*, for concluding that the name *Christian* came from God, any more than from Antiochus Epiphanes! This may be too strong for some who contend that the *name* Christian is of divine authority; but let them put me to the proof.

That it was given neither by dream, oracle, angel, nor apostle, is, in my judgment, by far the more probable opinion. If it had been given by the authority of the Lord it would not have been delayed for *ten years* after the day of Pentecost, nor reserved for the city of Antioch to be the place of its origin.—"The *disciples* were first named *Christians* in Antioch, A. D. 43." But some person may say that the disciples had not become Christians till 43, and that the conferring of the name at Antioch was because it was the first time the *disciples* deserved it. It is true the term *disciple* is a much more *humble* name than the name Christian, and that persons may be found worthy of the name *disciple*, who are not worthy of the name Christian.—To be a Christian is to be a follower of Jesus Christ, and a disciple is a learner, a scholar. One who wishes to be a *Christian* may be called a *disciple;* but every disciple of Plato; Pythagorus, or Christ, is not worthy to be called a Platonist, a Pythagorean, nor a Christian. But there is a loose, as well as a strict use of words; and there is a national and sectarian, as well as a literal and philological usage of them. Hence every citizen of the United States is a Christian in Algiers, in India or Japan. But not to lose sight of the subject before us; with us it is a strong argument, that had the disciples been first called Christians by *divine appointment* at Antioch, then the apostles would, from that time forth, have addressed the disciples by this divinely appointed name. But this they did not so much as *once* in any public document which has come down to us. The Antiochians called the disciples first Christians; Agrippa used the term once in reference to himself; and Peter said, that if any man was endited as a Christian, or, "if any man suffered as a Christian, let him not be *ashamed;*" which argues that it was under this name their enemies persecuted and traduced them.

But no document has come down to us authorizing us to think that this name Christian was regarded by any of the Apostles as of divine appointment.

If Paul, in any of his letters—if Peter, James, or John, had only once said, "To the *Christians* in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Greece, Asia, Judea," or any where else; then, indeed, there might have been some ground to think that they regarded it as of divine appointment! And recollect it was 50 years and more from the time they were first called Christians, before all the New Testament was written. They are called disciples, saints, believers, the called, sanctified, in the Acts and in the Epistles; But never once addressed under the name Christians.

Now let it be remembered, that we have no objection to the name Christian if we only deserve it; nor predilection for the name *disciple*, except for its antiquity and modesty: But when it is plead for as of divine authority, and as the only or most fitting name which can be adopted, we must lift up our voice against the imposition, and contend for our liberty, where the Lord has left us free. Would to God that all professors could be addressed as saints, faithful brethren, disciples indeed, christians.

Our brother of the Messenger has called for those remarks, which are offered in the same candor in which he appears always to write. We have very high respect for him and the brethren who are with him. Many of them with whom we are acquainted we love as brethren; and we can, in all good conscience, unite with them in spirit and form, in public or in private, in all acts of social worship.

We do not conceive that we have adverted to every thing in the preceding article worthy of our attention. We have reserved some items for another occasion; but the chief points are noticed directly or indirectly in the preceding observations. We should like to have a very free, familiar, and affectionate correspondence with brother Stone on these subjects which he has introduced through the medium of the press. As I have copied his communication into these pages, I doubt not but he will copy these remarks in reply into his. And indeed I think the question of union and co-operation is one which deserves the attention of all them who believe the ancient gaspel and desire to see the ancient order of things restored.

EDITOR.

REMARKS ON A. CAMPBELL'S REPLY ON UNION, COMMUNION, AND THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

Bro. A. Campbell has made some strictures on my essay on union, and the name *Christian*. These I have carefully read, and have given them a place in the Messenger for the information of others. I once heard an old Baptist preacher say, that the enemies to christian Union, were the world, the flesh, and

the Devil; and I will add, said he, the fourth, more mischievous than all, the preachers. The remark is humiliating to this class of christians, and willingly would I prove it false. Since that time the impression has remained indelible on my mind, and to good effect. I am aware of the deceptibility of the human mind, and of its strong propensity to make for ourselves a *great name*. This was the spirit of the builders of ancient Babylon; and figuratively, the church in her apostacy is called Babylon, because possessed of the same spirit. Until this proud spirit sink at the feet of Jesus, and we become cordially and joyfully willing to decrease, that Christ may increase, I cannot anticipate as near that happy period of the church, so much talked of and prayed for at this time. Great zeal is manifested, and great exertions are made to advance religion, and great effects too, are produced; but so little of apostolic religion is seen, that I fear the zeal, the exertions, and the products all lack the divine impress of heaven. So long have the clergy stood in the way of truth's advancement—so long has the deleterious shade of sectarianism, like the shadow of death, chilled the life's blood of christianity—so long and so often have the preachers divided those whom God had joined together by the spirit of truth, that I am afraid of myself, and jealous of others. I would rather my hand were palsied, than that it should direct a pen to any of these unhallowed purposes.

Our worthy bro. Campbell does not understand me, when I said, "That we (the Reformers and Christians) were united in spirit, and that no reason existed on our side to prevent the union in form." On the "union in form" he makes many extravagant conjectures as to my probable meaning, for which I am by no means accountable. No form of union did I suggest; nor could I, probably, propose the best, were I to attempt it. I know of no people united as a church, but have some form of union. Some simply agree to worship together according to the New Testament—and some have their names enrolled together. As to a confederation of churches, and such unscriptural associations, as practised by the different sects, I have long since rejected them. This I thought bro. C. well knew. I confess I have sincerely wished that the Christians and Reformers, who are united in spirit, should also be united in form. I know of neighborhoods where some of each class reside, who remain scattered and disunited, and who from their local circumstances and paucity of numbers, could not form two respectable congregations, yet united could be a respectable church. I have thought it better that they *formally* unite, and worship together as a congregation of brethren. This induced me to write as I did; and in order to effect this union I endeavored to remove the objections made against it. Of these objections, bro. C. could find but one, yet two are mentioned by me in numerical order, and each the subject of his strictures.

His third paragraph, on which he solicits my most definitive

view, I plainly confess, I do not fully understand. I have imputed the obscurity to a *lapsus pennæ*, incident to the most accomplished scholars; or to a defect in my own intellect—to the latter, probably; for I find now, that I have misunderstood him, on the *ancient gospel*, and the *ancient order of things*, from the beginning, if his statements be correct. In this I am not alone, for the Reformers of my acquaintance, as well as the Christians, have thought there were but light shades of difference between us. Under the impression that we understood bro. C. and the Reformers, I stated a few facts for the purpose of removing any existing bar between us—facts I yet believe incontrovertible. In stating these facts, he thinks he discovers a squinting at some sort of precedence, or priority in our claims to having taught the faith and practice of the gospel many years before he was known as a teacher; which faith and practice he has since received, and taught. (I did not intimate that he received them from us. It is hoped, he received them from a higher source, the Bible.) Can bro. C. think it degrading to him and his brethren, that we first taught many things which they now teach? I cannot believe it. We think we too discover something more expressive than squinting, in our worthy brother—a plain denial of *our claims* to priority in teaching the gospel before him. For such claims we will not contend a moment; nor do we boast in them. If the gospel be preached we will rejoice, without regard to persons or times. The truth of God, and not the glory of man, I hope is our aim and object.

He grants indeed that we "*then* opposed authoritative creeds, and some articles in them as terms of communion, and some other abuses," (this is an ingenious concession!) but he roundly denies that the present advocates of reformation are at all pleading for what we taught or plead many years ago, after the dissolution of the Springfield Presbytery—and thinks, I cannot have such conceptions—that the questions of the ancient gospel, and the ancient order of things, distinguish the cause for which they plead, most easily from every other cause plead on this continent, or in Europe, since the great apostacy—and sorry would he be to think that any one would be so indiscriminating as to identify the principles of this reformation, with the principles of any other reformation, preached since Luther was born. These are high pretensions, which we have never presumed to make. If indeed the ancient gospel, and the ancient order for which they plead, be the gospel and order of the New Testament, may God speed them! may every other gospel and order forever cease, and disappear before the light of heaven! Yet I cannot see *most easily* the distinguishing traits of the ancient gospel for which they plead, from what has been taught by us long ago; unless it be that they attach more importance to baptism, than we have generally done, and that they may not attach so much virtue to the direct operations of the Spirit in obedient believers as we do. If there be any other difference

than these, I have yet to learn it, and gladly would I learn, if indeed the gospel they preach be truly the ancient gospel, plead by them *alone*.

As to the ancient order of things, both we and the Reformers have agreed that sectarianism, authoritative creeds, and ecclesiastical councils, composed of uninspired men, are contrary to this order, and therefore rejected, at least in word, by us both, as not being divinely warranted.—We both immerse penitent believers.—Some, not all, of both classes contend for, and practise weekly communion.—They differ from us in rejecting from communion the unimmersed, and in the ordination of elders or bishops. To what particular order brother C. may refer, as plead by the Reformers *alone*, I should be glad to know; and if indeed it is proved to be the ancient order, nothing shall prevent me from falling into it. He may have different views on these subjects from others, but this is no proof that these views are right.

He says, that the eagle-eyed opponents of the Reform see the radical difference between us, and therefore in many places more highly esteem the Christians than them. Such opponents may see what his friends may not see. This is not uncommon. But, says he, I told him last winter in conversation, that the Christians were more highly esteemed by the orthodox than the disciples. Yes, I did; but I never dreamed that brother C. would, so inadvertently transgress the common rules of decorum, to publish a part of a conversation to my injury, without giving an explanation of the cause why I thus spoke. Lest a wrong impression should be made on any mind, I will state, that in the conversation alluded to, the subject of union was the topic. I remarked my fears, that should a union not take place between us, that the argument we both had long used against authoritative creeds, and sectarian establishments, would be nullified, that we should put a weapon in the hands of our opposers, which they would successfully wield against us. They would say that the Bible alone was insufficient to unite christians, and our example would be adduced as proof. He then remarked that when he first commenced preaching the Reformation in the east, that is was considerably checked by reports of us in the west, who had been long before him advocating the same cause, and had run into the wildest extravagancies in doctrine and practice. He plainly intimated his fears that the existing prejudices against us would impede the progress of the reformation, should the union take place. I then remarked, we by such a union, would have as much to lose as they could have, believing that we were equally, if not more respected by the orthodox. To this effect I spoke, not boastingly, nor vainly, as it might be presumed by those unacquainted with the topic of conversation. His fulsome remarks respecting the comparative respectability of the Christians, and of the editor of the Messenger, are viewed as mere sar-

casm, for which I have no talent. Had I even the genius of Lucian or Swift, against my friend I could not cast a wounding dart. I may have misapprehended him; if so, I hope for forgiveness. There needs no contest who are most despised by the orthodox, whether they, we, the Shakers, Mormonites or infidels. The *odium theologicum* proves none of us right, nor does the contrary prove any of us wrong.

With regard to communion with the unimmersed, I have fully stated my reasons for it in former numbers. Those reasons still incline my mind to the same practice. I may hereafter be convinced of their weakness, and that the contrary are correct; should this be done, I shall prove by my conduct that I endeavor to be regulated by my convictions of truth. —I am as fully convinced as he can be, that immersion is baptism, and that baptism is for the remission of sins—I am as fully persuaded that every penitent believer should be immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ as he can be; yet I remember the people of God have been long in the wilderness, and have been misled to the neglect of this ordinance; as the Israelites of old neglected a divine command, (circumcision,) when in the wilderness between Egypt and Canaan. I have no doubt that speaking and urging the truth in love, with christian forbearance, will ultimately effect what a contrary course will fail to do. I plead not for Pædobaptists; that they are in error I have no doubt. But who is infallible? I have no interest in pleading for them, for we are rejected by them all around us. I am influenced by principle alone.

But brother C. complains of the following remark, "We cannot, with our present views, unite on the opinion, that unimmersed persons cannot receive the remission of sins, and therefore should be excluded from our fellowship and communion on earth." This, says he, is not the question. If in writing this sentence I have transgressed the bounds of christian propriety, I plead ignorance, not design, as my apology. With others I have believed this to be his sentiment. Not long since I asked a very intelligent brother of the reformation, whether he believed, that none but the immersed, received the remission of sins? He answered unhesitatingly, yes. After a little conversation, he granted that God could, and did forgive in some instances without immersion under the New dispensation. This is all for which I contend; and if bro. C. believes this I can see no material difference between us. I grant, that before immersion was preached for the remission of sins in these last days, I opposed the sentiment that immersion should be the test of fellowship, for similar reasons.

Brother C. in vol. I, pa. 373, made some remarks on the name *Christian*, which we considered very severe, & designed to sink us in the public estimation. We remonstrated in a firm, but christian spirit. As he has never thought proper to retract, or soften the hard features of those remarks, we took it *pro confesso* to be his fixed opinion. He acknowledges the name *Christian* most appropriate, yet for reasons there stated, he should advise the older name *Disciple*. I remarked on *Union*, "We cannot conscientiously give up the name *Christian* acknowledged by our brethren, most appropriate, for any other, (as disciple) less appropriate, and received—(*assumed* says bro. C. *i. e.* "arrogated, or claimed unjustly," Walker.)—to avoid the disgrace of being suspected to be a Unitarian or Trinitarian. We cannot thus temporize with divine truth." On this he remarks. "Well, bro. Stone, do not temporize with divine ordinances by substituting sincere sprinkling for sincere obedience, or for immersion." The advice is acknowledged good, and by me shall be received and acted upon, as I have for many years invariably done, ever since I submitted to immersion. I have never substituted sprinkling sincere nor insincere for immersion. This is well known by all who are acquainted with my history for years back. True, we have never been required to abandon the name Christian, yet objections are often made, such as bro. C. has himself made formerly, and in these very strictures, against being called Christians, but by the "more humble name, disciple." "Persons may be found(says he) worthy of the name disciple, who are not worthy of the name christian. To be a Christian is to be a follower of Jesus Christ, and a disciple is a learner or scholar. One who wishes to be a Christian, may be called a disciple, but every disciple of Christ is not a Christian." He plainly intimates that the reason why the disciples at Antioch were first called Christians, was because they first deserved it.—These are extraordinary sentiments from the pen of one, who so closely adheres to the written word!—Where in the precious book will he find these distinctions?—A Christian, says he, is a follower of Jesus Christ—Is not this the very description of a disciple? Whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple. Luke xvi. 27. Are not the men worthy of the name Christian, who love one another and bear much fruit? This is the character of disciples. John xiii. 35; xv. 8. All immerced believers are babtized into the kingdom, and being born of water are the children of the kingdom, and all bear the same fruit in unequal measure, some thirty, some sixty, and some an hundred fold. Who of all these shall be called disciples, and who christians?—The kingdom of heaven is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. All born into this kingdom by immersion, surely partake of these qualities, if not in the same degree.—How shall they be designated? which shall be called disciples and which Christians? The church, according to brother C. is composed of two classes, disciples and christians, and every disciple is not a christian, is not a follower of Christ —This church would appear to be modelled according to the form of a popular church now in being, composed of believers and seekers. I confess I am better satisfied with the sentiment of Paul,

Eph. III. 15, where speaking of Christ, "From whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." This includes both Jews and Gentiles, who believed and obeyed the Saviour. If we are unworthy of the name christian, equally unworthy must we be of the name disciple, for they include the same character. The better reason why they were named Christians first at Antioch, A. D. 43, is that about this time, the Gentiles first received the word of the Lord, and were introduced into the kingdom. Then, in order to destroy all national distinction, divine wisdom ordained that they should be named Christians.

This we consider a satisfactory answer to bro. Cs. argument against the name Christian as being of divine appointment. "If, says he, it had been given by the authority of the Lord, it would not have been delayed for *ten years* after the day of Pentecost, nor reserved for the city of Antioch to be the place of its origin. The disciples were first named *Christians* in Antioch, A. D. 43. Because the name Christian was delayed *ten years* after Pentecost, it cannot be of divine authority! Was brother C. himself when he wrote this? Might we not say with as good reason, Because the gospel was delayed to be preached to the Gentiles ten years after Pentecost, it cannot be of divine authority? or Because the Messiah did not come in the flesh till near 4000 years after the fall, therefore his coming is not by divine authority? Must God give us an account of his actions *when*, *where*, and *how?* or if not, shall we judge them as done without divine authority? Where can be the impropriety of not calling them Christians till ten years after Pentecost? And where the impropriety of calling them so first at Antioch! Indeed in this we see the wisdom of God, because the church in Antioch was composed of Jews and Gentiles, and that of Jerusalem was entirely of Jews. God determined wisely, in order to prevent division and contention, that this name should destroy all national distinction, and be as a bond of union forever after.

In arguing the propriety of the name Christian, I adopted the translation of Dr. Doddridge, as follows: "And the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch." The word *named* is translated from the Greek *Chrematisai*. This word, says Dr. Doddridge, signifies *named by divine appointment*. His authorities I quoted. Brother C. says, "We could not in good conscience substitute the *opinion* of Dr. Doddridge for the literal import of the word *Chrematizo*." I think the *opinion* of Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Benson, Dr. A. Clark and others, as good as that of Dr. G. Campbell, or Dr. Parkhurst. The translation of a word is only an opinion, and the probability of its truth rests upon the evidence adduced in its support. The evidence in support of Doddridge's translation of the word, is that the word is used with this signification in every other passage in the New Testament where it occurs.—Brother C. observes, "Every body knows that there are no

words in the Greek corresponding to "divine appointment."—I also observe, that every body ought to know that such an adjunct would be superfluous, because the word *chrematizo* always in the New Testament plainly conveys this idea. Hear the learned A. Clark on Acts XI. 26. "The word *chrematisai* in our common text, which we translate *were called*, signifies in the New Testament, *to appoint, warn*, or *nominate* by *divine direction*.

In bro. C's. preface to the New Translation, he very justly remarks, That the 70 Hebrews, who translated their own scriptures into the Greek language, gave to that translation the idiom of their vernacular tongue. Their translation, if I may so speak, is a sort of Hebrew-Greek. And, in effect, it comes to this—that we have no Greek, by which to understand the Apostolic writings, but the Greek of the Jewish and Christian prophets,—consequently, incomparably more regard should be paid to the Septuagint, than to the Classic use of Greek terms.—"This idea had Dr. Clark, no doubt, and therefore he was led to say that *Chrematizo* signifies in the New Testament to appoint, to warn, or nominate by divine direction. The Dr. well knew, what every Grecian knows, that in the Greek Classics the word frequently has a different meaning. My friend Campbell has been too precipitate in affirming so roundly, that the word means no such thing as to appoint, warn or nominate by divine direction. We will cite him even to his own authorities to prove his precipitancy. "Wetstein on Ron. VII. 3, has abundantly proved that the verb active (*chrematizo*,) frequently signifies in the Greek writers, *to be named or called.*" Park in verbo.—This authority of Wetstein proves two points, that the active verb *chrematisai* in Acts XI. 26, is to be construed passively, and that it signifies in Classic Greek writers to be named or called. This will be disputed by none; but bro. C. himself, with us all, admits that the Greek Classics are not good authority to understand the apostolic writings. But let us hear Wetstein on the apostolic writings. "The word *chrematizo* signifies, *to utter oracles, give divine directions*, or *information*. see, Heb. XII. 25. Josephus and Diodorus Siculus apply the verb active in the like view. See Wetstein on Matt. II. 12. Park in verbo.—Wetstein fully confirms our idea of the word, though supposed by bro. C. to be against it. The learned Schrevelius is also against my friend Campbell in his assertion that the word means no such thing as to warn, appoint or nominate by divine direction. Schrevelius defines the verb active *oraculum reddo, to utter oracles.* In the passive he agrees with Parkhurst, it means *to be divinely admonished.* Schr. in verbo.

Bro. C. says, "Our worthy friend has been too precipitate also in quoting Adam Clark on this passage, (Acts XII. 26.)—A. Clark begins the section, from which he quotes, with an *if.*" Does my friend C. impeach the logical skill of Dr. Clark, by imputing to him doubt, when he had immediately before stated

unequivocally the meaning of the word *chrematizo*? What smatterer in logic does not know that the word *if* is often used where no doubt or uncertainty is implied? Did Paul doubt that there was any consolation in Christ Jesus, when he said, *If* there be any consolation in Christ Jesus? Does our worthy friend, when he uses the word *if*, wish us to understand that doubt is always implied? Certainly not.—

As to the derivation of the word *chrematizo* from *chrema, business*, copied from Scapala as quoted by Parkhurst; and as to his application of it, we can only use his own language on another subject, it is the weakest and most vulnerable argument ever plead against the name *Christian*. In conclusion of his critical remarks, he says, I am bold to affirm in the face of all criticism, that there is not the least authority, *in the word here used*, for concluding that the name *Christian* came from God, any more than Antiochus Epiphanes!" This looks imposing; but strong affirmation is not argument convincing. Indeed, I should be afraid to make such an assertion, lest I should injure the truth; especially when the word in every other place where it occurs in the New Testament, plainly conveys the idea of divine admonition, warning, revelation or appointment. I refer to the passages, quoted in my essay on Union, which I believe are all where the word occurs in the New Testament.

He says, If Paul or any of the Apostles, had only said, "To the Christians in Rome, Corinth, &c.—then there might have been some ground to think they regarded it as of divine appointment."—I add, Had the Apostles only said "To the Disciples in Rome, &c." we should have concluded that this name was preferred by them to the name *Christian*. But if it be an argument that the name was of divine appointment, had the Apostles said, "To the Christians"—then the argument is equally good, that *saints, believers, the faithful*, are names of divine appointment, for so the Apostles addressed them. Why then prefer the name disciple to any one of these? Can we think that the bitter enemies of the disciples of Christ would have given them so appropriate a name, as that of Christians? And would they have consented to wear it, had they believed it to be given by reproach, and not by divine authority? Would the inspired Apostles have recognized and gloried in this name, had it not been of divine origin? Do the opposers of brother C. and his warm adherents give them the name they are willing to wear, and which they deem appropriate? Will they glory in being called Campbellites, infidels, &c.

I think James has given us as strong an argument for the name *Christian* as of divine appointment, as if he had addressed his epistle, "To the Christians." He says, Do not they defame that excellent name which is named upon you? (New Transl. Js. II. 7.) Bro. C. lets us know in the conclusion, that he has no objection to the name Christian, if we only deserve it. May the Lord enable us to deserve it indeed! But if we live

unworthy of this name, I cannot see how the "more humble and modest" name, disciple can be deserved. These humble remarks are submitted to the public. EDITOR.

MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.

So great has been the exertions of the clergy in begging money to carry on their benevolent schemes in order to convert the world to their particular parties—So great stress is laid on money to effect this end—So great are the fears of many that these monied institutions will ultimate in clerical domination—So great is the disgust at this system of money-begging—that modesty, ashamed hangs her head, and religion blushes that money should be thought her best support. Multitudes there are, whose claims to piety cannot reasonably be disputed, yet are so offended at this course that they almost think it wrong to give money, or its equivalent to the preachers of their own choice; and many of our preachers, in the same spirit, foster the principle, and indispose many from assisting them in any degree out of their abundance. The consequences are very obvious;—the churches are greatly neglected—the preachers oppressed—they contract a worldly spirit—neglect study—and the advancement of truth and religion ceases. The preachers I say, are oppressed. They, in common with their neighbors, must labor to support themselves and families; and are commonly blessed with more company than others—this not only calls them from their necessary labors, but also helps to consume their earnings. If they attend to the many calls of the churches, they must deprive themselves and families of a necessary support—if they do not attend they are unmercifully censured. Who, by hard labor through the week, can be prepared to address a people profitably on the Lord's day? What time is allowed such a preacher to study the scriptures? His spirits are depressed—his discourses are unedifying, he becomes unpopular, and sinks from usefulness. In this state of things the churches decline, and the spirit of truth flags. What must be done?

I will give advice:—Let every church seriously consider the situation in which we are. Let them meet together in their respective places of worship, and give an answer to the following queries:

1. Ought not those who preach the gospel, live of the gospel?
2. Can we expect that they can thus live of the gospel unless we who profess the gospel administer to their support?
3. Is it right for us to rob their families of support, by calling them to administer to us the word, and refuse to administer them our carnal things?
4. Ought we not to devise some plan to aid them in the work of the ministry?
5. Would it not greatly conduce to the advancement of truth, if the churches; (say in the North of Ky.) were to engage two

preachers to ride steadily, and preach among them day and night? Such two preachers have been consulted—each has a dependent family, and each anxious to serve his master and the churches in this way. We have calculated on the most economical plan:—We think $300 to each, paid quarterly, with the industry of their families, will support them, They are willing to undertake for this small sum. They are among the most respectable of our preachers, whose praise is in all the churches. No one can think for a moment that gain is their object.—We are persuaded that great good would result from this course.

Let each church meet together immediately and act on the subject without delay. Let each member affix to his name the sum which he is willing to give, and let their Deacons send me the account as soon as possible. It can then be determined whether the plan proposed will be adopted.

I know many object against subscribing for the support of a preacher. They say they are willing to give, but they wish not that their right hand should know what their left hand does. Those people, most generally keep their offerings so secret, that they are never known in earth or in heaven. No man should leave the support of his family upon such uncertainties. If the churches do not act with promptness on this subject, it must fail of success.—While thousands of dollars are lavished in support of sectarianism, shall the friends of peace and union, be unwilling to give a few mites to aid in spreading the good cause? Forbid it, Heaven!

EDITOR.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

The projectors of the scheme to exclude all but Trinitarians from this Society, instead of listening to the rebuke which they received at the annual meeting, are pursuing their object with an intemperance that would grace a better cause. It appears that they have organized a committee for this single end, and have issued a Circular, signed by nearly 80 persons, which is styled in the Eclectic Review, "the Manifesto of the Sackville Street junta." The Review speaks of their purpose in these just though severe terms. "This is we believe the first time that a provisional committee was ever formed (not for the purpose of instituting a Society) but with the avowed object of disturbing an institution long established, by forcing upon it the views of an inconsiderable and defeated minority. This provisional committee is nothing better than an organized conspiracy, how specious soever its object, which if successful would overturn the whole management of the Society." The circular proposes eight resolutions, the four first of which will be sufficient to show its character.

1. That we, whose names are undersigned, do form a Provisional Committee, with power to add to our number, for the purpose of uniting in such measures as may induce the British and Foreign Bible Society to reconsider the decision of the late Anniversary General Meeting of that Institution, and to bring about a separation in point of membership from those who do not acknowledge the Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

2. That a Society, whose object is to circulate the pure Word of God, and upon which devolves the responsibility of preparing and issuing new translations of it, must be considered decidedly a religious society, and ought pre-eminently to be conducted on Scriptural principles.

3. That, considering the British and Foreign Bible Society to be an Institution of the character above described, it is our opinion that those who do not acknowledge the Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Trinity cannot consistently be admitted members of the Society.

4. That we, therefore, pledge ourselves to use all Christian means in our power to have the British and Foreign Bible Society firmly established upon the above principles."

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The division which arose on the case of Mr. Barnes is not likely to be healed. Dr. Green, the editor of the monthly Christian Advocate, aided by the Presbyterian, a weekly journal issued in Philadelphia, is the champion of the party opposed to Mr. Barnes; while Dr. Ely in the Philadelphian maintains his ground with a true billigerent spirit. A paragraph from the last paper may startle some of our readers.—*Ch. Register.*

THE HIGH CHURCH PARTY ORGANIZED.

We can no longer deny that there is a *Party* in the Presbyterian Church, organized after the fashion of a political faction. We publish the following *warlike Manifesto* for the information of all concerned; and if we must have battle, we are glad that we may enter the field in full possession of the plan of our fraternal foes.

REMARKS.

To us it is strange that Dr. Ely should speak so disrespectfully of a *party* in the Presbyterian church, organized after the fashion of a *political faction*, when he has long been considered by the community, as the head, or rather the organ of a politico-religious party, to establish an orthodox government in the United States. To us it is passing strange, that the only heaven-born—the religious exclusionists—those who bar the gates of heaven against all but the orthodox, should manifest a spirit infinitely distant from christianity! Can such *fraternal foes* of each party, be the only heaven-born? Can they yet boast of orthodoxy?—Will their orthodoxy supply the place of humble religion? We are almost persuaded that, according to an Eastern print, the strongest tie of union in this rich, fashionable and learned body, is their benevolent institutions. These, it

will be discovered from a preceding article, cannot long exist, and then "O Israel to your tents." We wait with interest the issue of the battle, now raging between these *fraternal foes*.—In Philadelphia the war will not be confined. In the West and in the East preparations are making.—Let all the friends of Jesus, and well-wishers of his cause, unite their prayers at the throne of grace for these *fraternal foes*, that they all may be humbled at the feet of Immanuel, and take his yoke upon them, and learn of him the meek and humble religion of heaven—that order may come out of confusion, and that the whole family of God may be united in the one body, and in the one spirit of the Lord and Saviour.

EDITOR.

Eaton, Ohio, September 15, 1831.

DEAR BRO.—The Messenger still affords much useful information, but it is generally thought not so much so as at first. I some time ago noticed an Editorial remark on the subject of Baptism, which was pleasing to me; it was to the following effect, that it had probably been the cause of so great a dearth in religion. That a measurable declention, or backsliding has taken place, is too evident not to be noticed by all. Where is the blessedness that we spake of and enjoyed some years ago? Are the servants of God filled with care for souls? Is Zion travailing in pain to be delivered? Do we hear new-born souls speaking forth the praises of God for redemption among us? I answer, but seldom. What is the cause? have we not let go the substance, and taken hold of the shadow? have we not lost the spirit in contending for opinions? have we not in a great measure lost that holy zeal for the glory of God, and for the advancement of his kingdom, which we possessed some years ago? My soul thirsts for that same holy fire, which prevailed in the late revival, and I may say, in every revival of pure religion. Let our united cries ascend to God, "thy kingdom come!"—Let us cease to contend for opinions, but for the faith once delivered to the saints; and learn, that without Christ in us, the hope of glory, we can do nothing; and in order that we may advance in holiness, it is not to learn a theory but to learn Christ.

There is nothing I think that so much revives a christian's heart, as to hear of the prosperity of Zion; or when sinners are crouding her gates; but our public prints have become barren in this respect. Yet we have now and then a convert;—last Lord's-day I baptized two; on Monday before bro. Clark baptized two, &c.

I do not intend this letter for publication, but wish to be understood that we long for a change of times; and that it is high time for us to cease contending for theory, further than to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; and that we contend more for holiness of heart and practical piety. May the Lord help, and take every weight from the wheels of Zion, that she may prosper gloriously.

We have lately been blessed with a visit from our friend and bro. Dr. Hall, who was once an editor of the Star in the West in this place, a zealous propagator of modern Universalism.—About two years ago he moved to the Wabash; he has become a christian, and is preaching the gospel of Christ with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. May the Lord be with him and bless him, and all his ministers with a double portion of his spirit, Amen.

HENRY MONFORT.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE LETTER.

Contrary to bro. Monfort's request I have given publicity to his letter. It breathes so much of the spirit of piety, I thought it right to counteract his wishes. His humility wishes to hide him from public notice, yet my knowledge of the man makes me confident that he will not be offended at my presumption.

He says, It is generally thought that the Messenger does not now afford as much useful information, as at first. This, I fear is true. In the commencement of the work, we gave much information of revivals in the West. This we were enabled to do, because frequent notices of them were given us by correspondents. But such revivals having in a great degree ceased, such communications, of course are less frequent. This is our apology for not giving more information on this subject, which our worthy brother most ardently desires.

Bro. Monfort professes to be well pleased with a remark I made in a former number, that one cause of the great dearth of religion among us, was, probably, that the public mind has been too intensely engaged on the subject of Baptism, and the controversies which have resulted from it. This is seriously my impression. Yet I do believe that great good has grown out of the investigation, and greater will yet be experienced, when the present storm shall have subsided. I have published far more on this subject than I desired; But I have not published the tenth part of the communications which have been poured in upon me on this subject. For this neglect I have incurred the displeasure of many brethren; and some have been so uncharitable as to impute to me partiality, or something worse. To please all is beyond the power of an Editor. From some I receive sentiments of high approbation of the Messenger; from others the reverse. If I continue the work longer I must pursue the course to which I may be pointed by the truth.

Such a revival as bro. Monfort describes, is what I ardently desire to see, and experience always; and the advice he gives I am confident is good, and which received and acted upon, will ultimate in a reformation glorious and universal. To his concluding prayer my heart responds, Amen.

EDITOR.

Extract from the Minutes of the Christian Conference on the north of the Kentucky River, in Ky.

"The Elders and Brethren of the Church of Christ, north of

the Ky. river, met in Annual Meeting, in Cynthiana, in the county of Harrison, on Friday the 16th of September, 1831.

Elders present; Barton W. Stone, Francis R. Palmer, Thos. Smith, John Rogers, John Roberts, John A. Gano, Leonard I. Fleming, William Parker, Martin Sidener, Joseph Mitchel, John Morrow, William Morrow, Jesse Bledsoe and Thomas M. Allen. Elders from Ohio; Matthew Gardner, Isaac N. Walters and Edward H. Lewis.

Eld. Thomas Smith was appointed Chairman, and Thomas M. Allen Secretary.—Letters and communications were then read and received from the following Churches, viz:

1,	Cynthiana,	Harrison	Cty.
2	Indian Creek,	do.	do.
3	Beaver Creek,	"	"
4	Kentontown,	"	"
5	Leesburg,	"	"
6	Paris,	Bourbon	"
7	Antioch,	do.	"
8	Cane-ridge,	"	"
9	Flat-run,	"	"
10	Clintonsville,	"	"
11	Mt. Carmel,	"	"
12	Lexington,	Fayette	"
13	Union,	do.	"
14	Berea,	"	"
15	Bethel,	"	"
16	Republican,	Fayette	Cty.
17	Palmyra,	Henry	do.
18	Mt. Pleasant,	do.	"
19	Georgetown,	Scott	"
20	Bethlehem,	do.	"
21	Ephesus,	Oldham	"
22	Tribble's,	Madison	"
23	Minerva,	Bracken	"
24	Concord,	Nicholas	"
25	Mt. of Johnson	do.	"
26	Bethlehem,	Gallatin	"
27	M'Kinney's,	Pendleton	"
28	Harrodsburg,	Mercer	"
29	North Fork.	Bracken	"

Bro. Isaac N. Walters, then made a communication from the Christian brethren of the Central Conference in Ohio, making known the desire of the brethren to cultivate friendship, from a more intimate acquaintance, and commence a correspondence with us. Bro. Walters also informed us, that he had received into fellowship upwards of 500 within the last two years, and had also himself immersed upwards of 220 in the same time.

Bros. Bledsoe, Palmer, Smith and Gano, were appointed to write a corresponding letter to the brethren in Ohio, assuring them of our christian love, and fellowship, and disposition to communicate with them by letter and messengers. The above brethren, or any one, or more of them, were requested to bear said letter, and meet the brethren in their next annual meeting.

Agreed that our next Annual Meeting be held at Clintonsville, Bourbon county, Ky. to commence on Friday before the first Lord's-day of October, 1832.

Adjourned, for social worship.

Attest, THOMAS M. ALLEN, *Secy.* THOMAS SMITH, *Chm.*

The above meeting was one of a very interesting character. It commenced on Friday morning, and continued till the Monday evening following. Although there were many churches not heard from, yet there was a very large number of brethren present, and some from the most remote congregations. To a number of the churches considerable additions have been made during the last year; and several new churches have been planted, in the same time. Able and efficient ministers have likewise taken the field to aid in building up the saints in the faith of the gospel, and disseminating the word of life to a perishing world. The *Christians*, have truly great cause to thank God for the glorious triumph and spread of the gospel of liberty. It must be pleasing and encouraging to our friends, to see those who are untrammelled by party names, and creeds, not only standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, but their numbers considerably increase by the addition of believers in the Lord Jesus—and likewise to learn of the organization of new churches built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Our brethren in different parts may take encouragement and comfort from the fact, that the good cause is yet flourishing, and the *truth* spreading among us.—Throughout the above meeting the congregations were large, solemn, and attentive. Twelve were added to the church, and many more appeared to be almost persuaded to be christians. Some were immersed forthwith, while others were compelled to defer their obedience for a short time. The meeting was evidently a great blessing to the town in which it was held, and also to a numerous assemblage of brethren and friends present; and we would rejoice to see such meetings multiplied in the country. Brethren, remember that it is good for the heart to be established with grace, and not be carried about with divers and strange doctrines. May the God of peace bless and support you, and enable you to stand fast in the liberty of the gospel, Amen.

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Baltimore, September 26, 1831.

Believing as I do that admonition is one of those things which devolve upon christian teachers, and that it is the duty of the faithful followers of Jesus to exhort, admonish, and correct one-another, in the spirit of love and meekness; I therefore tender to my preaching brethren the following advice. It is very requisite in this present evil day, that we be governed by that wisdom which cometh from above, because it is profitable to direct. We are engaged in a glorious work of reformation, we are calling the people's attention to the sacred oracles, we are exhorting them to cast off sectarianism, to exchange their badges; yea, if it should be that of the Pope for that of Jesus, great care should be taken here, or we shall fall in the same pit other reformers have fallen into. Although we are much indebted to the reformation effected by the instrumentality of Luther and Calvin, yet we must be ware of the rock on which they struck, and like the skilful mariner, steer a clear coast. Luther made war with the Pope, but he assumed too much author-

ity himself, he would not be bound by the creed of Rome, but he made a creed which bound others. Calvin contended against the power of the Man of sin; but O my friends, who was it that arrested and burned Servetus. Alas for the reformation which these men brought about! What was it? was it complete? Oh no, Jesus did not reign king, and therefore their work was incomplete. Our employment then should be to call men's attention to Jesus, to his government, to his manner of life, to his obedience. All power is given unto him, no mortal must share that power with him. Reformers then should be wise as serpents and harmless as doves. We must not overthrow the king, and become ourselves the resident. We must not condemn the creeds and preach our own opinions; we must preach "The Word," adhering strictly to the *form* of sound words. I will here mention a fault in some preachers, when they are pointing out false notions contained in the creeds, we very often hear them opposing them in some such strains as this, "The creed reads thus, but I think differently, I believe otherwise, I think I am right, &c. &c." Now before any of us allow ourselves to condemn any part of a creed, let us be well convinced that it is hostile to the word of God, and then we need not say, we think so, we can show them positively it is so. And I would here propose a more excellent way, instead of taking a portion of any creed to speak against it in public, let us preach the gospel, and show the people the importance of taking the scriptures for their rule of faith and practice. Whenever we discuss the Trinity, instead of preaching Jesus as the Saviour of sinners, we shall convert nobody to the truth. The arch-enemy does not care what we dispute about so that no inroads are made into his kingdom. Suppose that we succeed in proving that the trinitarians have explained the subject of Christ's mission into a mystery, what have we gained? why in the language of the prophet we have spent our time for nought, because it seldom works a change in any man's life; this is the great thing, a change of life, a reformation of manners: some may ask, do you think it of no importance to have right views on those subjects; most assuredly I do, but this is not the way to get them. I say preach the gospel without any admixture of human science, persuade the people to believe in Jesus Christ, and take his yoke upon them, to trust in his word and be guided by it, and when they are convinced that their creed is of no more service to them, they will not contend for any of its parts, then will the victory be to the glory of the gospel; but as long as a man thinks his creed divine, he will not be convinced of the impropriety of any idea it contains, the avenues of his mind are closed at the commencement and therefore he is proof against arguments drawn either from scripture or reason. OMICRON.

Within a few days past we have immersed five in Georgetown. We have the comfortable prospect of more shortly. May God grant that multitudes may submit to, and humbly obey the Lord'

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."—PAUL.

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY.—DECEMBER 1831. [No. 12.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

GOOD NEWS.—The Sun of Liberty dawning on Scotland.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

At the last meeting of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, Mr. Scott, Mr. McLean, Mr. Irving, and Mr. Campbell were branded as heretics, and deposed from their office as Ministers of that Church, for preaching doctrines contrary to the Confession. In speaking of the deposition of Mr. Campbell, the Christian Pioneer says:—

The manner in which this was done, was worthy the deed.—After the vote for Mr. Campbell's deposition had been taken, and it was nearly unanimous, a prayer was offered up by Dr. Muirhead of Cramond Of the purport of that prayer, we know not; but we do think, under all the circumstances, it savoured much more of mockery than adoration. Here were professed disciples of Jesus, who had just deprived a brother of his bread, and fixed the stigma of opprobrium on his name, and who were about ro listen to their president pronouncing sentence—at prayer! I cannot give you a farthing, said the priest of the fable, but I will give you my blessing. The blessing was worthless, because it sprung not from true charity. Would the prayer of bigotry be more acceptable?

Prayer being ended, the Moderator thus spoke: "It is now my painful duty painful indeed beyond expression, to pronounce the solemn and deliberate judgment of the General Assembly, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole King and Head of this Church; and by virtue of the power and authority committed by him to it, I do now solemnly depose Mr. John Macleod Campbell, Minister of the parish of Row, from the office of the holy ministry, prohibiting and discharging him from exercising the same or any part thereof, in all time coming, under the pain of the highest censure of the church; and I do hereby declare the church and parish of Row vacant, from and after the day and date of this sentence-"